

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT  
DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JUAN PABLO MARTINEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B234969  
(Super. Ct. No. F449990)  
(San Luis Obispo County)

Juan Pablo Martinez appeals from the judgment entered following his negotiated plea of no contest to one count of a forcible lewd act and one count of a non-forcible lewd act on a child under the age of fourteen years, with a 16-year “lid” on his sentence. (Pen. Code, § 288, subs. (a), (b).)<sup>1</sup> The trial court imposed a 16-year state prison sentence (a consecutive 8-year, term for each count). It ordered appellant to pay \$4,013.50 restitution to the Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board, with additional restitution under specified circumstances. (§ 1202.4, subd. (f).) It also imposed a \$6,400 restitution fine pursuant to section 1202.4, subdivision (b), and imposed and stayed a \$6,400 restitution fine, pursuant to section 1202.45.

Appellant molested his step-daughter on numerous occasions between 2009 and 2010, when she was either eight or nine years old.

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to the Penal Code.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief raising no issues and requesting that we independently examine the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.

We advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. Appellant submitted a supplemental letter brief. He challenges the restitution orders because he lacks adequate funds to pay restitution, and his family needs any money he has earned or will earn. The restitution orders are authorized by law. (§§ 1202.4, subds. (b), (f); 1202.45.)

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 124; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

PERREN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P.J.

YEGAN, J.

Michael L. Duffy, Judge  
Superior Court County of San Luis Obispo

---

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal; Juan Pablo Martinez, in pro. per., for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.